	Case 2:05-cv-02124-JCC	Document 32	? Filed 11/30/06	Page 1 of 3
01				
02				
03				
04				
05				
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
06	WESTERN DISTRICT COOKT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE			
07				
08	CHARLES O'CAIN,) CA	SE NO. C05-2124	-JCC-MAT
09	Plaintiff,)		
10	v.))) OF	DER DENYING J	OINT MOTION
11	STEPHANIE MURRAY, et al.,) AN	AND AGREED ORDER TO ALTER DEADLINES	
12	Defendants.)	DEADLINES	
13)		
14	This is a pro se civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges in his complaint			
15	that defendant Stephanie Murray, a Corrections Program Specialist at the King County Regional			
16	Justice Center ("RJC"), interfered with private phone calls between plaintiff and his attorney.			
17	Plaintiff further alleges that the King County Jail has a custom and policy of supervising all			
18	attorney calls for inmates on phone deadlock, and that deadlock inmates therefore have no private			
19	call privileges with their attorneys.			
20	On April 20, 2006, the Court issued an Order Re: Pretrial Preparations in which it			
21	established certain pretrial deadlines. Among the deadlines set by the Court was a September 20,			
22	2006, deadline for the parties to submit their joint pretrial statement to the Court. The parties			
	ORDER DENYING JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER TO ALTER DEADLINES PAGE -1			

failed to comply with that deadline and, thus, the Court issued an Order on October 2, 2006, in which it directed the parties to submit their joint pretrial statement not later than November 15, 2006.

On October 17, 2006, the parties filed a document entitled "Joint Motion and Agreed Order to Alter Deadlines." In that document, the parties represented to the Court that upon meeting to confer regarding the joint pre-trial statement, plaintiff expressed an interest in amending his complaint and defendants agreed not to object so long as all other deadlines relevant to an amended complaint were altered. On October 24, 2006, the Court received from plaintiff a proposed amended complaint. Plaintiff, by way of his proposed amended complaint, seeks to add the following new defendants to this action: Sue Rahr, King County Sheriff; Reed Holtgeerts, Director of the King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (KCDAJD); Hikari Tamura, identified only as the "Chief of Administration"; and, Bob Deneui, Corrections Program Administrator Supervisor at the RJC.

In order to sustain a civil rights action, a plaintiff must show (1) that he suffered a violation of rights protected by the Constitution or created by federal statute, and (2) that the violation was proximately caused by a person acting under color of state or federal law. *See Crumpton v. Gates*, 947 F.2d 1418, 1420 (9th Cir. 1991). To satisfy the second prong, plaintiff must allege facts showing how individually named defendants caused or personally participated in causing the harm alleged in the complaint. *See Arnold v. IBM*, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981). A defendant cannot be held liable solely on the basis of supervisory responsibility or position. *Monell v. Department of Social Servs., of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 691-694 (1978). Rather, a plaintiff must allege that a defendant's own conduct violated the plaintiff's civil rights. *City of*

ORDER DENYING JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER TO ALTER DEADLINES PAGE -2 Canton, Ohio v. Harris, 489 U.S. 378, 385-90 (1989).

While plaintiff suggests that the proposed new defendants were somehow responsible for the constitutional violations alleged in his proposed amended complaint, he alleges no facts demonstrating that any of these individuals personally participated in causing him harm of constitutional dimensions. As plaintiff has not adequately alleged a cause of action against any of 06 the proposed new defendants, plaintiff will not be permitted to amend his complaint. And, since plaintiff will not be permitted to amend his complaint, there is no reason to alter the Court's previously established deadlines, with the exception of the deadline for the filing of the joint pretrial statement.

Accordingly, the Court does hereby ORDER as follows:

- The parties' joint motion and agreed order to alter deadlines (Dkt. No. 29) is (1) DENIED.
- The parties are directed to file their joint pretrial statement not later than (2) January 16, 2007.
- (3) The Clerk shall send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for defendants, and to the Honorable John C. Coughenour.

DATED this 30th day of November, 2006.

United States Magistrate Judge

18

01

02

03

05

09

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

AND AGREED ORDER TO ALTER DEADLINES PAGE -3